



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles.

PROFESSOR E. Y. HINCKS.

ANDOVER, MASS.

IT is now ninety years since the discussion of the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles began with the publication of Schleiermacher's essay entitled *Ueber den sogenannten ersten Brief des Paulus an den Timotheos*. It is more than sixty years since the appearance of Baur's *Pastoralbriefe* opened a second stage of the discussion. During this interval most New Testament critics have taken part in the controversy. It has yielded a considerable amount of agreement as to two secondary topics, the unity of authorship and the impossibility of a date preceding Paul's arrest in Jerusalem. There are now few, if any, scholars who would follow Schleiermacher, Usteri, Lücke, Bleek, Neander, and others, in accepting 2 Timothy and Titus as Pauline, and setting aside 1 Timothy as not genuine. It is generally conceded that the three letters are essentially one in style and thought. To be sure, some scholars who do not believe that Paul wrote 2 Timothy find in it fragments of letters addressed by him to Timothy; but as the passages thought to be from his pen are brief and consist of personal messages, their opinion of the letter is practically that of the great majority.

It is pretty generally conceded, also, that no place for the composition of the letters can be found in that part of Paul's life covered by the narrative of the last chapters of Acts. The English critics, who of late years have maintained that the Apostle wrote them, have felt obliged to show that he had opportunity for doing so after the sojourn in Rome recorded by Luke came to an end. Weiss, whose defence of the letters is the only one of note made of late by a German, finds the chief obstacle to their acceptance the fact that if Pauline they belong to a period of Paul's life following the point at which all our New Testament sources of information about his career (except these letters) terminate.

The long discussion has not brought about any general agreement as to the main question. In Germany, Weiss is not alone in thinking that the controversy is not ended. Heinrici agrees with him, or at any rate did in 1886.¹

In England the Pauline authorship of the letters is affirmed by the majority of leading New Testament scholars. The same is true of American scholars, so far as their publications are known to me. Dwight, in his preface to Meyer (published by Funk and Wagnalls, 1885), held that the letters were probably written by Paul. McGiffert, however ("American Journal of Theology," i. 148), expresses the opinion that the imprisonment of Paul recorded in Acts ended in his death; from this it may be inferred that he regards the letters un-Pauline.²

To predict the outcome of the discussion would perhaps be premature. Certainly a prediction avowedly drawn in part from its author's opinion as to which side has the stronger case, would count for little with those who believed that the weight of argument was with the other side. If one were resolutely to put out of his mind his estimate of the merits of the question, and try to estimate the outcome simply from the controversy itself, as an outsider might do, he would be likely, I think, to predict the triumph of those who maintain that Paul did not write the letters. Edwin Hatch says in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, probably with truth, that "the majority of modern critics question or deny the authenticity of the letters." This fact itself, however, is not the most significant feature of the discussion; such questions are not settled by counting names; and the history of criticism has shown that the cause which for a time seemed the weaker one, may prevail (that of the priority of Mark to Matthew, for example). What is more significant is that the defensive party act as if conscious of having on their hands a difficult task. Weiss, for example, does not seem fully convinced that Paul wrote the letters. His latest deliverance about their authorship is:³ "It is quite proper to explain these letters upon the supposition that they are what they profess to be, letters from the unknown period of Paul's

¹ *Die Forschungen über die Paulinischen Briefe; Vortrag auf der theologischen Conferenz zu Gießen*, 1886, S. 101 f.

² In his *Apostolic Age*, published since the above was written, McGiffert argues (pp. 398-414) that the Pastoral Epistles are not by Paul, though founded on Pauline material.

³ *The Pauline Epistles in the corrected text. With a short commentary*, etc. Quoted by Gregory, "American Journal of Theology," i. 27.

life, after his release from the Roman imprisonment." What a different tone is this from that in which Weiss maintains the Johannean authorship of the fourth gospel !

The English critics talk about the authenticity of the letters in a way suggesting secret misgivings as to the strength of their position. Take for example Sanday's remarks in his volume on Inspiration. "The bearing of the Pastoral Epistles upon the question has led Professor Ramsay to examine afresh the question of their genuineness, and his vigorous judgment has decided in their favor. . . . Another important work which has appeared within the last few weeks, Godet's *Introduction to the Pauline Epistles*, also states the argument from a more professedly theological point of view, but in a very convincing form. . . . It may be asserted without fear of contradiction that nothing really un-Pauline has been proved in any of the disputed epistles." General assertion, bolstered up by the opinion of those like-minded, — this is not the way in which an intelligent man, who has solid arguments at his disposal, maintains an imperilled cause. Hort, in the course of lectures published posthumously under the title *Judaic Christianity*, shows his consciousness of the difficulty of the task he has undertaken in a more engaging way. "We come now to the Pastoral Epistles. On the critical question of their genuineness I must say very little. . . . There are features of the Pastoral Epistles which legitimately provoke suspicion. . . . The real difficulties lie in the field of language, and of ideas as embodied in language." Then follows a general remark or two, after which Hort says: "The main points connected with this subject have been discussed, and for the most part admirably discussed, by Bernhard Weiss, of Berlin." Hort then goes on to examine the erroneous teaching condemned in the Pastoral Epistles, "which," he says, "is the only part of the subject which directly concerns us now." The feature of the letters which most needed defence according to his own admission, Hort passes by. In doing so, it is true, he follows out the scheme underlying his course of lectures ; but does not the scheme suggest some reluctance to face the critical questions which are vital to the whole discussion ?

The posthumous volume of *Biblical Essays*, printed from the late Bishop Lightfoot's lecture notes, contains a chapter devoted to the Pastoral Epistles. This discussion, a far more complete and satisfactory one than Hort's, not only admits that the letters differ from the other epistles attributed to St. Paul, in vocabulary, style, and thought, but states some of their leading lexicographical, stylistic,

and doctrinal peculiarities. The bearing of these peculiarities on the question of authorship is, however, not even alluded to. Assuming that the letters must have been Pauline, Lightfoot goes on to discuss their date, and to examine the heresy attacked in them. Neither here nor anywhere else, unless I am mistaken, has he given serious attention to the reasons urged by scholars of three generations and of different critical schools for believing the letters to be from another hand than Paul's. "It is not thus that fields are won."

Some students of the Bible believe that inquiry into the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles is unnecessary. These documents must have been written by Paul, they think, because God would not let his church put a pseudepigraph into the Canon. Those who hold this belief must think that full investigation will show that the church was led to a right opinion, and will at least be harmless. They may even think it likely to benefit those who do not find in the canonicity of a scripture a vindication of its authorial claim. Probably there are not many intelligent ministers who would not say to one who asked if there were historical evidence that the New Testament contained the religious ideas of Christ and his apostles, "Yes, there is. We have as good reason for thinking that the Gospels contain remembered words of Jesus, and that the apostolic letters were written by the apostles, as that what purport to be the orations of Cicero were written by the Roman author." Such an answer lays on him who gives it a moral obligation to welcome the application of historical criticism to any part of the New Testament.

It may be presumed that all earnest and serious students of the Bible wish that the discussion of the authorship of these letters should not stop. Critical investigation, honestly and diligently pursued, leads toward the truth. Intellectual self-respect obliges us to think so. We need the truth as to the authorship of these letters. Were such a consensus of opinion about them reached as has been gained with regard to the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, no doubt it would be regarded by intelligent people generally as a valuable achievement of Christian science. Certainly the New Testament scholarship of this country and of England would occupy a more dignified position than it can have while affirming the Pauline authorship of documents, and neglecting to consider the careful and serious reasons by which Continental scholars have supported a contrary conclusion.

In presenting this subject, I cannot hope to say much that is new, or nearly all that is pertinent, but I can hope to give a very little aid

to a valuable discussion; and I beg that my wish to do this may serve as some excuse for the meagreness of the paper and the triteness of much of its contents.

Criticism of the Pauline letters, excluding the Pastoral Epistles and Hebrews, has given to the vast majority of critics a scientific conviction of the genuineness of almost all of them; to the greater number a belief that all are genuine. As regards the four chief letters, there is practical unanimity. The recent endeavor to show that Paul could not have written them has made little impression. The replies which it has called forth are, I believe, very generally regarded as finally disposing of it. ¹ Thessalonians, Philippians, Philemon, are now ascribed to Paul by the great majority of critics of all schools. ² Thessalonians and Colossians are now accepted as Pauline by perhaps the greater number of German as well as English and American scholars; this view of their authorship having made noticeable gains during the last few years. Some critics of note who accept Colossians are in doubt as to Ephesians (Schürer, Jülicher); but as those who do not think this letter to have come in its present form from Paul regard its ideas and language as borrowed in great degree from Colossians, the critical dissent may be disregarded in a search for the documents in which Paul's style and thought appear.

These ten letters were written during the Apostle's years of maturity; the last of them but a very few years at most before his death. They are so numerous, have such a connection with important events in Paul's ministry, and are in the aggregate of such bulk, that they furnish the basis for a good knowledge of his vocabulary, literary style, doctrinal ideas, personal traits, and religious aims. They also give much indirect information about the state of the Pauline churches during the years 53-62.

The letters to Timothy and that to Titus claiming to be from the Apostle's hand, obviously belong together, and as obviously stand apart from the others, as they manifestly belong to a different kind of work, that of indirectly influencing the churches through agents. Historical criticism confirms the impression of difference by showing that the letters in question could not have been written by the Apostle during the period of work which produced the earlier ones. We now ask whether the criteria of Pauline authorship ascertained from the ten which bear critical tests are found in these three certainly later epistles.

I. Is the tone of the Epistles such as we should expect to find in letters written from Paul to Timothy and Titus? We know the

Apostle's character ; we know much about the relations which these fellow-workmen sustained towards him during his active ministry. We know his practice about the disclosure in his letters of his feelings towards their recipients. We should feel pretty sure of some characteristics which a letter written by him to Timothy would show. Do the Pastoral Letters show these traits? Of course, we have to apply this test to them separately.

The two addressed to Timothy are, if genuine, separated by a considerable interval, so that the second cannot be regarded as supplying the deficiencies of the first. What are the personal words addressed to Timothy in the first letter, those which especially touch his life? He is told (1 Tim. 1^{3 ff.}) to do the work for which he has been left at Ephesus ; he is reminded (1¹⁸) of the prophetic words spoken about him (presumably at his ordination). He is told to fight well, to keep faith and a good conscience (1^{18, 19}) ; is bidden to remind the people that seducers will come ; and so be a good minister of Christ (4^{6 f.}) ; to shun the profane and old women's fables, to avoid the (ascetic) bodily regimen and exercise himself to godliness (4^{7, 8}) ; to set such an example of fidelity that no one will despise his youth. He is warned against neglecting the gift that is in him (4¹⁴) ; is told to take heed to himself and to the teaching (4¹⁶) ; is solemnly charged to avoid partiality and prejudice in his dealing with presbyters (5²¹) ; to be discreet in his conduct toward young women (5²) ; to give up drinking water and take a little wine for his health (5²³) ; to shun the pursuit of wealth and of the pleasures which wealth can secure (6¹¹) ; to keep the deposit of truth, turning away from the profane babblings and oppositions of the so-called knowledge (6²⁰).

Do we hear Paul's voice in these exhortations? Is the tone such as we should expect him to use in writing to Timothy? The accent of spiritual authority is here, and we should expect it in any letter that the Apostle would write to his convert and helper ; we should look for it with confidence in a letter in which a great charge was committed to Timothy. But there is another note which we should expect to hear when Paul addressed the friend of many years, who had accompanied him on long journeys, had shared his cares and dangers for at least ten years, had undertaken for him a difficult mission in Corinth, had been commended by him to the Roman church as a ' fellow-laborer ' (Rom. 16²¹), who followed the Apostle after his arrest to Rome to minister to him in his imprisonment, — we should expect to hear in a letter from Paul to this devoted friend and helper, even were it much briefer and more hasty than that

before us, the note of approving and tender affection. There is in 1 Timothy no allusion to Timothy's long years of Christian service and devotion to the Master, unless such an allusion may be found in the words *γνησίῳ τέκνῳ ἐν πίστει* (1²). These words, which might have been as appropriately written as soon as Timothy was converted, can hardly be called a recognition of the labor of those years. Timothy is exhorted to keep out of heresies, to maintain propriety in intercourse with young Christian women, to lift his youth above contempt by good conduct, to keep covetousness out of his heart,—as if he were beginning his service. Would not a man of Paul's tact and delicacy of feeling have blended with such exhortations, if he had thought it necessary to address them to one who had been as fully tried as Timothy had been, such allusion to his friend's proved faithfulness and such expression of confidence in him as should have taken from them the power to wound? When he exhorted the Thessalonians to keep at home and mind their own affairs (1 Thess. 4¹¹), he prefaced the exhortation with the conciliating and graceful words, "As to brotherly love, we do not need to write to you; for you have been taught by God to love each other, and ye show this in your conduct toward all the brethren throughout Macedonia; and we exhort you, brethren, that you abound more and more," etc.

Paul was wont, when writing to Christian people, to express warm appreciation of their virtues and services. Every one of his letters contains such commendatory words (not excluding 2 Thessalonians, which is a mere appendix to 1 Thessalonians, nor the letters written to churches which he had not himself visited), except the letters to the church in Corinth. The displeasure in which he wrote to that church is evidently the cause of the omission of the commendatory words in this single instance. And even here we find evidence of the impulse to write them in words as near commendation as the circumstances admit, the glad acknowledgment in 1 Corinthians of the gifts enjoyed by the church (1⁷), and the tender recognition in 2 Corinthians of the change of feeling brought about by Titus (7^{6ff.}).

Can we believe that the tenderness and tact which Paul showed in his letters to the churches did not also characterize those which he wrote to his friends? We cannot think so, if we believe that the Apostle's dealing with the churches was a really genuine expression of his disposition. True considerateness and delicacy of feeling, if in him, would appear more plainly in his intercourse with his best friends than anywhere else. We have an important fact justifying this supposition in the letter to Philemon. I cannot but

feel that the exhortations of 1 Tim., excellent as they are in spirit and expression, if regarded as really addressed by Paul to his old friend and devoted helper show a lack of gentleness and tact. "If thou remindest the brethren of these things, thou wilt be a good minister of Christ Jesus" (1 Timothy 4^{6f.}), — had he not been this many years, and did not Paul know that he had been? — "nourished in the words of the faith and of the good teaching which thou didst follow. Shun the profane and old women's fables, and exercise thyself rather in the direction of godliness," — what else had he been doing since he left home to follow Paul over sea and land? "Let no man despise thy youth." Perhaps Paul could have called one who had been his companion and helper ten years, whom he had sent on an important mission to a great church five years before, a youth; that he could have exhorted him not to bring discredit on his youth by boyish actions seems scarcely credible, when one remembers the refined and gracious courtesy of the letter to Philemon. "Take heed to thyself and to the doctrine; . . . for by doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee" (4¹⁶). Is it to Timothy that this is written? and by the man who wrote even to the unruly Christians of Corinth, "Faithful is God, through whom ye were called into the fellowship of his son Jesus Christ our Lord"?

I am obliged to feel that 1 Timothy does not bear our first test of genuineness. Let us apply it to 2 Timothy. What are the words of this letter in which the attitude of Paul towards its recipient is especially evident? Timothy is addressed as "my beloved child" (1²). Paul remembers him continually in his prayers, longing to see him (1³), since he remembers Timothy's tears (shed when they separated). Paul has in remembrance Timothy's sincere faith which he has inherited from his maternal grandmother through his mother (1⁵). Timothy is exhorted to stir up the divine gift bestowed on him at his ordination, a gift of moral forces and qualities, power, self-control, love (1^{6,7}); to keep firm hold of the Pauline teaching (1¹³); to be strong in grace (2¹); to endure hardship as a good soldier of Jesus Christ (2³); not to entangle himself in worldly matters (2⁴); to keep himself pure and to be a vessel for the nobler uses of God's house (2²¹); to fly from youthful lusts and follow after righteousness, faith, love (2²²). He is reminded that he has by personal observation gained a knowledge of Paul's doctrine and character, of the persecution he endured, as in Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra (3^{10ff.}); is told to abide in the things which he has learned and has believed, since he knows that he has received these things from godly relatives,

and has been taught from childhood the holy Scriptures (3^{14 ff.}). He is solemnly charged to be faithful in his work, to be sober in all things, to do the work of an evangelist, to fill out his ministry. Then follows the summons to come quickly to the Apostle, from whom all his friends except Luke have gone away (4^{9 ff.}).

The letter opens with words of affection. And we find connected therewith approving words like those Paul seems usually to have coupled with his expressions of love. Cf. Philemon⁴, "I thank my God, always making mention of thee in my prayers, hearing of thy love, and of the faith which thou hast toward all the saints." Cf. also Phil. 1^{3 ff.}. The approval is, however, not directed to that which we should have expected Paul to commend in Timothy, his Christian devotion and his helpfulness to the Apostle. Paul thanks God, remembering his friend's sincere faith which came to him through his Jewish ancestry on the mother's side. Nowhere in the letter is appreciation of his Christian ministry expressed. Indeed, after the initial expression of love, the tone of the letter is like that of 1 Timothy. The writer looks down from the height of his apostleship upon the young man, and exhorts him to curb his youthful passions, to be brave and faithful and unworldly. What was said about the lack of tact and grace noticeable in the exhortations of 1 Timothy, when regarded as addressed by Paul to this devoted friend, applies to those of 2 Timothy. "Suffer hardship with others as a good soldier" (2³). Had he not done this for many a year? "Fly youthful passions" (2²²). Had he not by this time shown that he had some power of self-control?

We pass on to Titus. He was a helper of Paul of even longer standing than Timothy, for we find him with Paul at the apostolic council (Gal. 2¹). In the painful transactions between Paul and the church in Corinth, he played a most useful part. To him was given the task of bringing the contumacious element which dominated the church to penitence, and he succeeded. We should expect that the tone of a letter written by Paul to him would be one of warm and approving love. The only words indicating affection are those of the salutation (1⁴). "To Titus, my own child according to a common faith." The tone of the letter is simply mandatory. "Say these things; and exhort and rebuke with all authority; let no man despise thee" (2¹⁵). Had Titus's past life given Paul occasion to fear that men would despise him? If Paul thought it had not, as *ex hypothesi* he did, he was the man to say so. This letter is in its tone more curt and cold than either of the others.

II. Let us now apply to the Pastoral Letters a second test : the congruity between the contents of each of the letters and the situation in which it places the author and the recipient. A real letter fits the occasion which it presupposes. Do these letters have this mark of genuineness?

I Timothy assumes that Timothy is in Ephesus ; that Paul, who has gone to Macedonia (1³), has left the church of that city (and probably the churches of the adjacent region) under his care. Paul expects soon to return to Ephesus. He seems to intend to resume, on his return, the charge of the Ephesian church. At least, nothing is said implying the contrary, and if Timothy were receiving a permanent charge, this (it is natural to think) would have been stated or intimated. Indeed, 3¹⁴, "These things I write to thee, hoping to come to thee quickly ; but if I tarry, that thou mayst know how it is necessary to behave in the house of God," evidently implies that the preceding directions belong to a service to be performed during Paul's absence. These directions refer to the ordering of public worship (chap. 2), the choice of bishops and deacons (3¹⁻¹³), rebuking heretical teachers (1^{3 ff.}).

The commands of the part of the letter which follows the words just quoted are for the most part of the same general nature ; they refer to Timothy's use of a delegated authority to teach the Ephesian church, and to direct the teaching and pastoral service of the bishops or elders (who seem to be identical),—to direct its life. Instructions are given as to the payment of elders and the discipline of the unworthy (5^{17 ff.}), as to the selection of widows for the widows' society (5^{9 ff.}), as to the treatment of the older and the younger men in the church, the aged and youthful widows, and as to what is to be said to the rich (6¹⁷). Besides, exhortations of a personal nature are given to Timothy to fulfil his duties faithfully. Nothing suggests that these commands are not called out by the occasion which called out the preceding ones ; on the contrary, we find among them the words (4¹³), "Until I come, take heed to the reading, the exhortation, the teaching."

Do the instructions given to Timothy fit the occasion presupposed? I have nothing to say here as to whether it is probable that the occasion existed. Assuming that Paul might have left the church of Ephesus for a season in Timothy's charge, with authority to appoint elders and deacons, to administer discipline, and to direct worship, and that he might have written Timothy a letter not long before his return, instructing Timothy in the use of his delegated authority, is

this such a letter as he might have written? It is altogether probable that before going away, the Apostle would have given his vicar directions as to the matters treated of in the letter. In that case, the instructions of the epistle repeat or fill out the initial instructions. We should expect in a writer as practical, skilful, and tactful as Paul was, some allusion to the fact. Certainly we should expect to find in the instructions now written some evidence of their complementary nature. There is perhaps such an allusion to previous teaching in regard to the course Timothy is to take towards heretical teachers (1³). With regard to the administration of church government, not only is there no suggestion that Timothy had been told how to act, but the directions, taken by themselves, would suggest that he had not. Why describe carefully the qualifications of a bishop, or a deacon, if Timothy already knew the kind of men Paul would put in these offices? Why tell the qualifications of the members of the widows' society, if these were well known? Why give the rule as to the payment of elders who both teach and govern, if this had been laid down before? Nay, the words, "I write, hoping to come to thee quickly, but if I tarry, that thou mayst know how one ought to conduct himself in the house of God" (3¹⁴) suggest that what has just been said (the qualifications for bishops and deacons) was written to inform the reader of something which he needed to know.

The instructions given in 1 Timothy of a more general nature are not such as would most naturally be spoken to direct the use of an authority about to be given up. "But thou, man of God, flee these things" (6¹¹). "Fight the good fight of the faith" (6¹²). "Keep the deposit, turning away from the idle babblings and oppositions of the knowledge falsely so called" (6²⁰).

1 Timothy, then, does not fit the occasion which it assumes to exist. Does 2 Timothy correspond in contents to the facts which it presupposes? The letter is assumed to be written at Rome. Timothy is assumed to be at work in the East, probably at Ephesus (4¹², cf. 4¹³). Paul expects a speedy and fatal termination of his imprisonment (4⁶⁻⁸). At the close of the letter Timothy is urged to leave his work and hasten to Rome (4⁹). The burden of the epistle is an exhortation to fidelity in the service assumed to be appointed. Timothy should stir up the gift bestowed on him at his ordination, should be brave and strong, should hold fast the apostolic teaching, should select worthy teachers and commit the truth to them, should rebuke quarreling about trifles, and shun himself the profane babblings of heretics, should seek the Christian virtues,

avoiding the sins of youth, and avoid foolish controversies. He should keep away from the immoral and seductive teachers who are abroad, and abide in the truth which he learned from the Scriptures. He is solemnly charged to fidelity in preaching and dealing with souls.

Evidently this letter bears the application of our second test better than 1 Timothy does. We can easily think that Paul would write from Rome a letter containing general exhortations like these. Though he hoped to see Timothy presently, and to express his wishes more fully than he could convey them by the pen, yet he might naturally set them down now, believing that the written words would be read and re-read after their writer's death. But should we not expect some recognition of the fact that the high and hard service pressed on Timothy is at the writer's request to be given up for a while, and of the further fact that probably soon a better opportunity of receiving the writer's thought of the work will be enjoyed? Should we, in other words, expect Paul, whose letters were above all things practical and appropriate, to charge Timothy just as he might have done if he were not to see him again? Certainly we should not have expected him at this time to tell Timothy to choose teachers and make over the Christian traditions to them, in terms suggesting that this thing had not been done. "What thou hast heard from me through many witnesses, commit to faithful men who shall be capable of teaching others" (2³). Assume the Pauline authorship of 1 Timothy, with its directions as to the choice of elders, and this exhortation seems un-Pauline. Deny the Pauline authorship of that letter, from which this cannot be severed, and you have answered the question whether this one is Pauline.

Titus, it is assumed in the letter called by his name, has been left temporarily in Crete, to set in order those things that remained to be put to rights, and to ordain elders in every city in the island (1⁵). The qualifications of these elders are given. A feature of the life of the church is pointed out, which makes elders capable of teaching well an imperative want,—the presence and activity of heretical teachers (1¹⁰). The people are to be rebuked for listening to these men (1¹³). Titus is told what practical moral instruction to give to various classes of his people. As soon as his successor shall have come to Crete, he is to go to Nicopolis to meet Paul.

We should not have expected a repetition of the oral instructions presumably given to Titus as to choosing presbyters; at any rate, unless it were accompanied by some explanatory words. We should

have expected some greetings to members of the church in Crete, where Paul is assumed to have been lately (1⁹). The salutation, "Greet those who love us in faith" (3¹⁵), lacks Paul's graciousness. Such an impersonal greeting could not have been greatly prized. A more serious incongruity with the assumed situation is the absence of any indication in the instructions given to Titus that his work in Crete is soon to come to an end. But for a single sentence, we should take for granted that he was permanently stationed in Crete. Here, as in 1 Timothy, we find such a charge as would fittingly be given to one entering on a life work putatively addressed to a laborer in the midst of a temporary one.

III. Let us now apply a third test to the Pastoral Letters, — that of doctrine. Are the religious ideas they contain those of Paul? The mind of the Apostle has left its mark upon their conception of redemption, — that of a gracious provision of God for mankind, making a new era in the history of the world (Titus 3⁴), effected through the death of Christ, who entered into the world to save it (1 Tim. 1¹⁵ 2⁶), who was a ransom for all men (*ibid.*). This teaching no doubt belongs to the Pauline type; the use of *δικαίωω* in the forensic sense (Titus 3⁷) confirms this conclusion. But the idea is not conceived just in the Pauline way. God saves men by means of the regenerating bath and the Holy Spirit's renewal (Titus 3⁵), so that being justified by his grace they may become heirs of eternal life. In the Pauline writings, men are saved from the wrath of God through accepting Christ, and so becoming justified before Him; united to Christ in baptism, they receive the Spirit as a principle of holy life.

A passage in 1 Timothy (1^{9f.}) gives the author's thought of the office of the Law. The self-styled law teachers do not know the scope and use of the Mosaic code. It is made not for the righteous, but for the lawless and immoral. The teaching of Galatians is that the Law was made for the whole Jewish nation, to bring it to Christ. All Jews are under its sway. The only way to get release from it is to become joined to Christ. Romans teaches that the Gentiles, too, were under the Law to all intents and purposes, since its ethical contents were revealed in their consciences (Rom. 2¹⁵). In the later Epistles we find this same conception of the scope of the Law. Paul says to the Philippians that he desires to be found in Christ, not having his own righteousness, that which comes from the Law, but that which is by faith (Phil. 3⁹). Evidently the alternative to being in Christ, and having the righteousness which is by faith,

is being under the Law, and having such moral claim as obedience to it gives. The Colossians are said to have died with Christ from the elements of the world (Col. 2²⁰). These "elements," thought of by Paul as spirits (cf. Gal. 4⁸⁻⁹), dominate men enslaved to the Law with its prescriptions as to meats, drinks, etc. Christians do not live in this physical sphere. They have died to Law. "Why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances?" (Col. 2²⁰).

"The law," says 1 Timothy, "is made not for the righteous, but for the immoral." Can we bring this into harmony with the Pauline teaching by identifying the Christians with the righteous and assuming that the non-Christian world is meant by the immoral? No. For Paul believed that when Christ came, while the whole world was guilty before God (Rom. 3^{19f.}), the Law had accomplished its end in its work upon the Jews (Gal. 3²⁴⁻²⁵). On the other hand, he did not believe that all Jews (to say nothing of heathen) were immoral.

The Pastoral Epistles make much of a teaching, a doctrine, *διδασκαλία*, with which Timothy and Titus are assumed to be familiar. It is repeatedly called "the healthy doctrine." The phrase seems to imply a contrast with doctrine which has become sickly by taking error into itself. Timothy received this doctrine from Paul; for he is bidden to "hold fast the model of healthy words received from me" (2 Tim. 1¹³). The exemplary quality of the teaching lies in its content. Here is a definite, a fixed teaching, which is to be retained. It is a 'deposit,' to be securely kept, — all of it. The author suggests that Timothy and the other Christian teachers should recognize and turn away from a different teaching which claimed to represent the contents of divine revelation (1 Tim. 6²⁰). In other words, the 'healthy doctrine' is the norm of Christian teaching (1 Tim. 1³). An explicit description of its contents is not given. As it includes the moral truths embodied in the gospel (1 Tim. 1³, cf. 1^{10f.} 6³⁻⁵), and is taken as a synonym of the word to be preached (2 Tim. 4³), it seems to cover the range of Christian teaching.

The word which Timothy is to impart is also called the word of the truth (2 Tim. 2¹⁵). Hymenæus and Philetus are said to have gone astray as regards the truth (2¹⁸). Again, certain evil men are described as withstanding the truth, and are contrasted with Timothy, who has followed the doctrine of Paul (3^{8f.}). Again, it is said (4^{3f.}) that the time will come in which men will not bear the healthy doctrine, but will, as those whose ears itch, pile up for themselves doctrines according to their own lusts, and will turn away their hearers from the truth. From these passages it is plain that the

writer identifies the wholesome doctrine with the truth; that the latter word denotes the thing when viewed in its content, the other designates it when viewed as authoritative doctrine. The truth is said to rest upon the church as its pillar and ground (1 Tim. 3¹⁵). This statement, read in the light of the Apostle's injunctions to Timothy and Titus to give the healthy teaching themselves, and to require others to give it, and to forbid the utterance of conflicting teaching, means that the church, through its teaching officers, bears up the definitely conceived Christian truth received from the apostles. As a doctrine, an ideal system, this is assumed to need a fixed place in human society and a centre of power. Resting on the church, it has such a place and centre. Here are two definite historical magnitudes, the organized church, the house of God, and the truth which rests upon it.

In the great Pauline letters, the communication given by God to men through the apostles is the 'good tidings.' This, viewed as a rational communication, is the truth; cf. Galatians 2⁵, "the truth of the gospel," and 2 Corinthians 4², "by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves," etc. And when communicated by the Apostle it is called the 'word of truth' (2 Cor. 6⁷), or the word of God (2¹⁷). The truth, or the gospel which is the truth, is not thought of as embodied in an apostolic doctrine, and to be as such 'a deposit,' nor a structure borne up by the church. It keeps manifesting itself through the living word of the apostles, but its dwelling and centre of power is apart from them. It is in Christ, in the historic facts of his life, death, and resurrection, which were the primitive gospel (1 Cor. 15^{3f.}). It is rather in that personality which is revealed in those facts. "God, who said, out of darkness light shall shine, is he who shone in our hearts for the illumination of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. 4⁶). Here is the truth, and here must men look for a test of religious teaching. The Judaizers who had bewitched the Galatians had taught another gospel, or rather they had perverted the gospel of Christ. The charge was not that they had taught something that contravened the apostolic teaching, but they had said that which was in conflict with that good tidings, the substance of which was the Son of God who was revealed to Paul (Gal. 1¹⁶), something which misrepresented Christ.

In the epistles of the imprisonment we find essentially the same conception of the apostolic utterance as related to the revealed truth. Paul writes to the Colossians that he has a stewardship in their behalf which is to fill out, give its own power to, the word of God,

which is the mystery of the truth of the gospel (1²⁵). The 'word' is the truth in expression; not in any set teaching, but in the gospel proclaimed by Paul. The erroneous doctrines of the false teachers are contrasted not with the apostolic doctrine but with Christ (οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν, Col. 2⁸). In Ephesians, the word of the truth is assumed to be identical with the gospel of our salvation (1¹³). We do not find in these later letters any reference to the teaching already given by the Apostle as containing the truth and as being a norm for its doctrine. The truth, the word, the gospel, is finding utterance through the Apostle, who asks others to come into his thought of it; it is 'in Jesus' (Eph. 4²¹). Between this conception and that of a 'wholesome doctrine,' a pattern of sound words learned from Paul, a truth borne up by the organized church, there is evidently a wide difference.

Let us compare the conception of the church, which is so conspicuous among the ideas of the Pastoral Letters, with that of the Pauline letters. It is, as has been already said, that of an organized society. The church, which is 'the pillar and ground of the truth,' is the house of God, containing utensils, some for high, some for mean uses; in which Timothy, Paul's agent, walks according to Paul's directions, choosing bishops or presbyters, requiring them to teach the wholesome doctrine, and to oppose those who go about with a conflicting teaching; which has its presbytery, its carefully selected deacons, and its company of devoted widows, each one sixty years of age, maintained by the community.

The church of the Corinthian letters is the 'body of Christ,' an organism whose vital principle is the Spirit of Christ. This divine power of life, which works ethically in each believer, generating love, has a special dynamic working in many, giving the impulse and capacity to serve the brotherhood by administration, by ministering to the sick or needy, by teaching, by prophesying. This separate endowment, or charisma, is the common spirit creating an organ by which the organism supplies its wants. The impulse and power to teach, prophesy, direct, come from within, and the right to exercise the gift comes with the consciousness of having it. The endowment is of divine bestowal, and the exercise is not conditional on ordination by the brotherhood. Neither the apostle, nor the prophet, nor the teacher, nor the healer, nor the administrator, receives his special gift after ordination, as the result of it; there is no evidence that the men who had those gifts were ordained.

There is nothing in the four great letters indicating that Paul made

provision for church organization, or believed that organization of the Christian community was an essential feature of its life. Nothing is said in these letters implying the existence of officers in the churches respectively addressed. If the church of Corinth had officers appointed to teach or to rule, the absence of reference to them in all that is said about the affairs of that church is hard to understand. See especially 1 Corinthians 6⁵, "Is there not any wise man among you who will be able to judge his brother's case?" And we find no suggestion that the church of Corinth, of Rome, or of Galatia had become organized in order to maintain its life or do its work.

Do we find a different conception of the church in the epistles of the imprisonment? In Philippians (1¹) the bishops and deacons are saluted as well as the brotherhood. This is, of course, a recognition of the fact of organization. That is, some members of that church were performing stated services of oversight and ministration. What the nature of those services was, and how those rendering them came to perform them, we do not know. Nothing is said suggesting that the apostle had created orders and inducted men into them. There is nothing said about a gift received through ordination, nothing suggesting that the church depended on the services of its officers for soundness of belief and purity of life. The command to beware of the concision (Phil. 3²), the exhortation to Euodias and Syntyche to heal their differences, the charge to the 'true yoke-fellow' to help the faithful women and Clement and the other laborers, give some reason for thinking that responsibility for providing the church with instruction and pastoral oversight had not been put upon a body of officers. The allusion to the bishops and deacons of Philippi, whatever inferences may be drawn from it as regards the life of that church, does not prove that the other Pauline churches had elected officers during the three or four years since Corinthians was written.

In Ephesians, both Jews and Gentiles are said to have been "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom the whole closely compacted building grows unto a holy temple in the Lord" (Eph. 2^{20f.}). This is the mystic conception of the church, found in Corinthians, enlarged by the addition of a historical element; enlarged, not transformed. The underlying and dominant conception is that of life. The temple lives and grows. The ascended Christ has given to his church 'apostles, prophets, evangelists, shepherds, and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of ministration, for the edifying of the body of Christ' (4^{11f.}). We have here still the mys-

tical body, service rendered by men divinely chosen and endowed. The apostles, prophets, and evangelists at least do not fill offices created by the church ; the function fulfilled by the church is not that of being a pillar and ground of the truth, but that of growing up into Christ, and of revealing to the principalities and powers in heaven the manifold wisdom of God (3¹⁰).

IV. One more test remains to be applied to the Pastoral Letters, that of style and language. I can only point out some of the most obvious results of a comparison of the style and vocabulary of these letters with those of the Pauline epistles.

We find in the documents before us a greater simplicity in the structure of the sentence ; there are fewer particles, fewer adjective and adverbial clauses ; the style lacks the play and sparkle of that of Paul's writings. The writer has a fondness for compounds with *φίλος* which does not appear in the Pauline letters, although they contain some words compounded with that verb. Such are : *φιλάγαθος* (Tit. 1⁸), *φίλανδρος* (Tit. 2⁴), *φιλαργυρία* (1 Tim. 6¹⁰), *φίλαντος* (2 Tim. 3²), *φιλήδονος* (2 Tim. 3⁴), *φιλόθεος* (2 Tim. 3⁴), *φιλότεκνος* (Tit. 2⁴).

Some peculiarities of expression may be pointed out. "Unfeigned faith" (2 Tim. 1⁵). Paul always gives *πίστις* without the qualifying adjective ; *ἔντευξις*, a word Paul never uses for prayer (1 Tim. 2¹ 4⁵) ; *δεσπότης* (2 Tim. 2²¹), applied to God, a word not found in the earlier Pauline letters ; *δυνάστης* (1 Tim. 6¹⁵), applied also to God, a word not used in the other letters ; *φιλανθρωπία θεοῦ* (Tit. 3⁴). "I was appointed a herald and apostle, a teacher of the Gentiles" (1 Tim. 2⁷). Paul nowhere couples other nouns with *ἀπόστολος* in describing his calling. He assumes that this one word sufficiently describes his work.

The proportion of words and phrases peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles is large ; 168, according to the count in Thayer-Grimm. Now 2 Corinthians, whose length is to that of the Pastorals, speaking roughly, as 7 to 6, has only 99. This peculiarity of the language is accounted for in part by the fact that the Pastoral Letters introduce new subjects, as in the case of *γάγγραινα*, *γενεαλογία*, *πάροις* ; only in part, however. Some of the new words are synonyms for others used by Paul ; *φιλαργυρία*, *ἔντευξις*, *ἄμαχος*. Others are within the range of thought through which the Pauline letters move, *e.g.*, *ἐγκρατής*, *ὠφέλιμος*, *et mult. al.* Others still express the ideas which are peculiar to these letters, and support the evidence of separate authorship afforded by those new ideas. In my opinion, however, stress is not

to be laid on the *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* as an independent indication of authorship, but they may be regarded as confirming conclusions drawn from the ideas and style of the letters.

The Pastoral Epistles differ widely, then, in their tone, their contents, their religious ideas, and their style from such letters as we have good reason to believe that Paul would write under such circumstances as they assume to have existed. The significance of these departures from the Pauline standard is greatly increased by their coincidence. This may be illustrated by a reference to Old Testament criticism. Professor Green and President Harper had a long controversy about the analysis of the Pentateuch. I read some of the papers advocating the analysis, and some of the replies; and felt that while Dr. Green had explained with much plausibility how the single facts pointed out by his opponent might have come into being, he entirely failed to explain the constantly recurring coincidence of the varied phenomena, which the documentary analysis undertook to account for. So, even if one should make a tolerably satisfactory explanation of the fact that Paul did not throw approving love into his letters to Timothy and Titus; and again of the fact that he wrote to men carrying on the duties of a temporary mission instructions befitting the commencement of an unknown and permanent work; and once again of his expressing ideas differing widely from those which he had taught at least up to within a year or two from the date assumed for the composition of the letters; and yet once more, of his having written in a different style from that in which he had written hitherto;—we should have a much harder task on our hands, that of explaining how in the same documents all these possibilities were realized. Even if that were done, some phenomena suggesting that the letters were written by another and later writer than Paul would still remain to be explained.

In 1 Timothy, Paul strenuously insists that he is an apostle (2⁷), “For which I was appointed a herald and an apostle; I say the truth, I am not lying.” Did Timothy question his claim to apostleship? Paul repeatedly quotes ‘faithful sayings.’ Were Christian proverbs in circulation in his day? Was this one (1 Tim. 3¹), “if a man reaches after a bishopric, he desires an excellent work,” likely to have been coined six years after Paul wrote 1 Corinthians? Supposing such sayings to have been in circulation, was it like Paul, the original and overflowing apostle, to keep quoting them?

Another phenomenon is the assertion (1 Tim. 1²⁰) that he had delivered over Hymenæus and Alexander to Satan. What is meant

this may be inferred from 1 Corinthians 5⁵. There Paul says that he had thought of delivering the immoral member of the Corinthian church "to Satan for the destruction of the flesh," *i.e.*, of inflicting some corporal punishment upon the man with Satan's help. Had he done this to these two heretics? If so, the punishment did not reach its end, for they were still abroad teaching. But the reference to it suggests that it had been effective: "That they might be taught not to blaspheme."

Another fact is the reference to the widows' society as a part of the existing church organization. Its qualifications for membership — an age of at least sixty years, fidelity in rearing children, tried Christian service, freedom from family cares, poverty — seem to have been suggested by the mature experience of the church. Had the church in Ephesus gone through this experience before the year 63?

Apostate and seductive men, whose appearance was predicted for coming days, are assumed to be already present (1 Tim. 4^{1*}). Is it Paul who writes this, or a writer who falls out of the generation in which he has put himself into his own?

Another fact to account for is that one of the sayings of Jesus is cited as Scripture (1 Tim. 5¹⁸). The *γραφή* seems to refer to both of the sayings quoted). Is it probable that a written gospel was in circulation and received as Scripture by A.D. 63?

Another fact to explain is that a biting saying of Epimenides regarding the Cretans is said to be illustrated in the defects of Cretan Christians. Would Paul have made the misconduct of some church members the reason for citing with approval this bitter word about a people?

Second marriage is set, in the Pastoral Letters, in the same inferior position in which it is placed by Hermas (*Mandat.* iv), Theophilus (*Ad Autolycum*, iii, 15), Athenagoras (*Legat.* 33).⁴

Does the assumption that Paul wrote the letters give a reasonable explanation of these separate phenomena, as well as of the groups of facts pointed out above?

It must be said that a criticism which does not meet this question will not stand. One writer has tried to evade it by evoking a *falsarius*, who had too much skill to write some of the passages most unlike Paul, and not enough to write some of those most like him; and by saying that it is easier to ascribe the letters to the

⁴ Holtzmann, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 236; Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, ii. 366.

Apostle than to this *falsarius*. But the question is not, "If Paul did not write them, who did?" but, "Did he?" If *he* did not, somebody else did. Possibly we may not find out who he was. What then? We do not know who wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews. That fact does not make us less confident that Paul did not write it.

Account has to be taken of the fact that we do not know of a time in Paul's life in which these letters could have been written. Perhaps we cannot be sure that he was executed at the end of the sojourn in Rome described in the Acts. So far as the indications given by Luke go, they hardly warrant, I believe, a positive opinion. We cannot affirm that if Paul was executed, Luke would have said so, for it is possible that he thought his task done when he had brought the Apostle's missionary work to a close. On the other hand, evidence of a release and subsequent period of work is very slight. The celebrated passage in 1 Clement v., "Because of zeal Paul received the reward of endurance; having borne fetters seven times, having been made a fugitive, having been stoned; having been a herald in the East and in the West, having taught the whole world righteousness, and having gone to the limit of the West and having borne witness before the rulers," is a slender support to this theory. Grant that the words *τέρμα τῆς δύσεως*, taken by themselves, naturally designate the limit of the Roman Empire; the clause "having taught the whole world righteousness" suggests that they may have been used rhetorically, and the immediately following words, "and having borne witness before the rulers" seem to make the *τέρμα τῆς δύσεως* the scene of the martyrdom, and therefore suggest Rome. I think, with others, that it is not impossible that Clement, in using the phrase, spoke from his own point of view. Holtzmann (*Pastoralbriefe*, p. 41) finds some support for this interpretation in a passage of the Clementines, which seems to be an echo of these words (Epistle of Clement to James, opening): *τῆς δύσεως τὸ σκοτεινότερον τοῦ κόσμου μέρος*, words which, of course, refer to Rome. The traditions which show Peter to have done an important work for the Roman church, make for the view that Paul died some years before 64. (See McGiffert, "American Journal of Theology" i. 146.) If we conclude that the words of Clement give reason for believing that Paul was released at the end of his two years' confinement in the imperial city, and went after his release to Spain, we have yet to find a place in his ministry into which these letters can be set. If he wrote them, he labored in the East after his release. We do not know that he did so. Clement says, according to the interpretation of his words which we provisionally

accept, that Paul then visited the far West. From such indications as we have as to the date of his death, it is probable that he did not visit the East before his (assumed) second arrest.

The letters are ascribed to Paul in the Canon of Muratori ; the reason for their acceptance among the sacred writings is clearly seen in the words of the Canon itself. "*Ad Titum unam, et ad Timotheum duas pro affectu et dilectione ; in honore tamen ecclesiae catholicae, in ordinatione ecclesiasticae disciplinae sanctificatae sunt.*"

They met the wish of the church of the second century to put its organization into connection with the work of the Apostle of the Gentiles and to trace the authority of its officers back to his apostolic authority. Hence they gained unquestioned recognition as Pauline by 175. We have in this fact no evidence respecting their authorship. Such evidence, using the word in its strict sense, could only come from one who had personal knowledge of the fact of their composition. The belief of the churches, two generations or more after they were written, that Paul wrote the letters, may give a presumption of their genuineness. This cannot pass into proof, such as historical science can give, unless borne out by the letters themselves.

If the inquiry as to whether Paul wrote the Pastoral Letters shall have led to the conclusion (as seems to me likely) that he probably did not, New Testament criticism will then find itself facing the hard, but interesting task of assigning them their place in the history of the subapostolic church. As to this I can here say nothing, except that if there is any period in the life of the church about which light is longed for by the students of church history, it is this one. If these documents, subjected to sound and thorough criticism, do something to illumine the years in which the apostolic church was becoming the church catholic, they will be very precious to Christian science.

But these Scriptures have rendered great service to the church in the way of edification. Will that service be impaired, if it shall be generally believed that Paul did not write them?

Why should learning the truth about any book of Scripture take from it any of its power to edify? Is there a single document in either canon of which we can say that its moral power over mature minds is conditioned on ignorance as to its author and his aim in writing it? Is there a Protestant minister who would say to his congregation about any book of the Old or New Testament, "The power this book has to benefit you would be lessened if you knew its author and his motive in composing it"?

Indeed, is it not evident that the more knowledge we have of the

historical environment and aim of any part of the Bible, the more benefit we are likely to receive from reading it? To be profited by Scripture, we must understand it, we must understand its allusions to current life, we must have moral sympathy with its author. Criticism helps us to attain these things. We understand the Epistle to the Hebrews better than if we supposed that Paul wrote it; we are more fully penetrated when we read it by the power of its author's thought and feeling. So, supposing that the Pastoral Letters were written fifty years after Paul's death, if we can put ourselves into their author's situation, and appreciate the wants of the church which he sought to supply by them, we shall find them speaking to us with fresher meaning and deeper power.

These letters will help us in proportion as we are conscious of touching reality and life in them; and this feeling, we shall gain from honest and faithful criticism, whatever its verdict as to their authorship may be.

It will be objected that if the Pastoral Epistles were not written by Paul they are impostures, and that impostures cannot foster moral and religious life. Reading them will be like hearing the preaching of a man we know to be corrupt; the good words will be evidently counterfeit and so void of moral power.

Why should we call what is technically termed a pseudepigraph imposture? Have we a right to call a document written fifty years or more after the death of a great man, in his name, in an age in which such a use of great names was customary, dishonest? to attribute guilt to him who wrote it? Can we not believe that the author might naïvely write out of a conviction that what he said was in harmony with the ideas and aims of the hero whose name he used, and was a continuation of his work? The custom of pseudepigraphic writing, the toleration by the community of the authorial use of great names, would make the transaction wear a different moral aspect to him from that which a similar one would wear to a man of to-day. One who believes that the Pastoral Letters were written in Paul's name fifty years after his death, will (considering his imperfect knowledge of the author's motive in ascribing them to Paul) be very reluctant to condemn him. And if he think the act censurable, he will remember that Paul's character is not absolutely flawless, and that Peter's had a serious defect.

Dr. George Salmon insists that we ought to call a man who would write a letter in the name of a deceased apostle a forger. If this were obligatory upon us, it would be an unpleasant duty, but it would

not alter the biblical facts nor offset the conclusions drawn from them. But would it not be reasonable, before applying to such a man a name which designates a modern criminal of a vile sort, to consider his act in its environment and its apparent motives? Few competent scholars believe that the author of Matthew found the genealogy of Joseph, with its three divisions of fourteen generations each, in any official register; it is altogether probable that that genealogy was brought into shape by the author's hand. What would Dr. Salmon have us call him? forger, or liar? What abusive epithet shall we apply to him for saying that Jesus uttered on the mount, when he spoke to the disciples about the kingdom, sayings which, as we know from Luke, he spoke not then but on other occasions?

Dr. Salmon justifies his denunciation of the pseudepigraph by saying that it was thought reprehensible by the early church. He supports the assertion by referring to the deposition of the presbyter who composed the Acts of Paul and Thecla; to use his gentle phrase: "the Presbyter who was deposed for forging the Acts of Paul and Thecla" (Salmon's *Introduction*, 4th ed., p. 541). But he says in another place (p. 361), "I think that if the tendency of the work had been felt by the church of the time to be unobjectionable, the author would scarcely have been deposed for his composition of what he could have represented as an edifying fiction, not intended to deceive." May we not appeal from the verdict of a writer affected by polemic zeal to that of the same writer engaged in the sober examination of historical fact, and conclude that after all there is no evidence that the church of the second century would have severely blamed such a use of Paul's name in the Pastoral Epistles as our criticism has suggested?